arXiv:1605.05626v2 [math.AG] 29 Sep 2016

NEW CLASSES OF MATRIX DECOMPOSITIONS

KE YE

Abstract. The idea of decomposing a matrix into a product of structured matrices such as triangular, orthogonal, diagonal matrices is a milestone of numerical computations. In this paper, we describe six new classes of matrix decompositions, extending our work in [8]. We prove that every $n \times n$ matrix is a product of finitely many bidiagonal, skew symmetric (when n is even), companion matrices and generalized Vandermonde matrices, respectively. We also prove that a generic $n \times n$ centrosymmetric matrix is a product of finitely many symmetric Toeplitz (resp. persymmetric Hankel) matrices. We determine an upper bound of the number of structured matrices needed to decompose a matrix for each case.

1. Introduction

Matrix decomposition is an important technique in numerical computations. For example, we have classical matrix decompositions:

(1) LU: a generic matrix can be decomposed as a product of an upper triangular matrix and a lower triangular matrix.
(2) QR: every matrix can be decomposed as a product of an orthogonal matrix and an upper triangular matrix.
(3) SVD: every matrix can be decomposed as a product of two orthogonal matrices and a diagonal matrix.

These matrix decompositions play a central role in engineering and scientific problems related to matrix computations [1],[6]. For example, to solve a linear system

$$Ax = b$$

where A is an $n \times n$ matrix and b is a column vector of length n. We can first apply LU decomposition to A to obtain

$$LUx = b,$$

where L is a lower triangular matrix and U is an upper triangular matrix. Next, we can solve

$$Ly = b,$$
$$Ux = y.$$

to obtain the solution of the original linear equation. The advantage of decomposing A into the product of L and U first is that solving linear equations with triangular matrix coefficient is much easier than solving the one with general matrix coefficient. Similar idea applies to QR and SVD decompositions.

Those classical matrix decompositions (LU, QR and SVD decompositions) correspond to Bruhat, Iwasawa, and Cartan decompositions of Lie groups [5, 2]. Other than those classical ones, there are other matrix decompositions. For instance,

(1) Every $n \times n$ matrix is a product of $(2n + 5)$ Toeplitz (resp. Hankel) matrices [8].
(2) Every matrix is a product of two symmetric matrices [3].

KY is partially supported by AFOSR FA9550-13-1-0133, DARPA D15AP00109, NSF IIS 1546413, DMS 1209136, and DMS 1057064.

As we have seen for classical matrix decompositions, Toeplitz, Hankel and symmetric matrix decompositions are important in the sense that structured matrices are well understood. For example, a Toeplitz linear system can be solved in $O(n \log n)$ using displacement rank [10], compared to at least $O(n^2)$ for general linear systems. Sometimes the matrix decomposition refers to the decomposition of a matrix into the sum of two matrices, see for example, [16, 17, 18]. However, whenever we mention the matrix decomposition in this paper, we always refer to the multiplicative version.

In this article, we study matrix decompositions beyond those mentioned above. We use Algebraic Geometry as our tool to explore the existence of matrix decompositions for various structured matrices. We define necessary notions in Section 2 and we prove some general results for the matrix decomposition problem and establish a strategy to tackle the matrix decomposition problem in Section 3. In Section 4 we discuss the matrix decomposition problem with two factors and recover the LU decomposition and the QR decomposition for generic matrices using our method. Here the LU (resp. QR) decomposition for generic matrices means that the set of matrices which can be written as the product of a lower triangular (resp. orthogonal) matrix and an upper triangular matrix is a dense subset (with the Zariski topology) of the space of all $n \times n$ matrices.

In Section 5 we apply the strategy built in Section 3.4 to matrix decomposition problem for linear subspaces. Lastly, in Section 6 we apply the strategy to matrix decomposition problem for non-linear varieties. We summarize our contributions in the following list:

(1) Bidiagonal decomposition (Section 5.1).
(2) Skew symmetric decomposition (Section 5.2).
(3) Symmetric Toeplitz decomposition and persymmetric Hankel decomposition (Section 5.3)
(4) Generic decomposition (Section 5.4).
(5) Companion decomposition (Section 6.1).
(6) Generalized Vandermonde decomposition (Section 6.2).

For each type of matrices in the list above, we first prove the existence of the matrix decomposition for a generic matrix, in the sense that the set of all matrices which can not be decomposed as a product of matrices of the given type, is contained in a proper algebraic subvariety of $\mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$. Then we use a result from topological group theory to prove the existence of the matrix decomposition for every matrix. The price we need to pay is to increase the number of factors. Our method can only show the existence of the matrix decomposition and no algorithm can be obtained in general. However, we do find an algorithm for companion decomposition in 6.1.

2. Algebraic geometry

In this section, we introduce necessary notions in Algebraic Geometry needed in this paper. We work over complex numbers but all results hold over algebraically closed fields of characteristic zero. Every notion we define in this section can be generalized to a more abstract version, but we only concentrate on a simplified version. Main references for this section are [7, 9, 12, 13, 19]

Let $\mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be the polynomial ring of n variables over $\mathbb{C}$. We say that a subset $X \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is an *algebraic subvariety* if X is the zero set of finitely many polynomials $F_1, \dots, F_r \in \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ and we say that X is defined by $F_1, \dots, F_r$. For example, any linear subspace of $\mathbb{C}^n$ is an algebraic subvariety because they are all defined by polynomials of degree one. Less nontrivial examples are algebraic groups such as $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$, the group of all $n \times n$ invertible matrices and $O(n)$, the group of all $n \times n$ orthogonal matrices. We remark here that $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ is an algebraic subvariety of $\mathbb{C}^{n^2+1}$ defined by

$$F(x_{ij}, t) = t \det(x_{ij}) - 1 \in \mathbb{C}[x_{ij}, t],$$

where $t, x_{ij}, 1 \leq i, j \leq n$ are variables and $\det(x_{ij})$ is the determinant of the $n \times n$ matrix (x_{ij}). Also $O(n)$ is an algebraic subvariety of $\mathbb{C}^{n^2}$ because $O(n)$ is the defined by

$$(x_{ij})^{\mathsf{T}}(x_{ij}) - 1 \in \mathbb{C}[x_{ij}],$$

where $x_{ij}, 1 \leq i, j \leq n$ are variables.

Let X be an irreducible algebraic subvariety of $\mathbb{C}^n$. We say that X is *irreducible* if X cannot be written as the union of two algebraic subvarieties properly contained in X. In other words, whenever $X = X_1 \cup X_2$ for algebraic subvarieties X_1 and X_2, we have

$$X_1 = X \text{ or } X_2 = X.$$

It is clear that linear subspaces, $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ and $O(n)$ are all irreducible. The algebraic subvariety X defined by the equation $x_1 x_2 = 0$ is not irreducible since X is the union of X_i which is defined by the equation $x_i = 0, i = 1, 2$.

Let $X \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be an algebraic subvariety. Let $I(X)$ be the ideal consisting of all polynomials $f \in \mathbb{C}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ such that $f(x) = 0$ for any $x \in X$. It is well known [9] that the ideal $I(X)$ must be finitely generated. Assume that $I(X)$ is generated by polynomials $F_1, \ldots, F_r$. Let J_p be the Jacobian matrix

$$J_p = \left[\frac{\partial F_i}{\partial x_j}(p)\right],$$

where $1 \leq i \leq r$ and $1 \leq j \leq n$. We define the *dimension* of X to be

$$\dim X \coloneqq \min_{p \in X} \{\dim \ker(J_p)\}.$$

The notion of dimension coincides with the intuition. For example, the dimension of a linear subspace of $\mathbb{C}^n$ is the same as its dimension as a linear space. The dimension of $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ is n^2 and the dimension of $O(n)$ is $\binom{n}{2}$. If $p \in X$ is a point such that

$$\dim X = \ker(J_p),$$

we say that p is a *smooth point* of X and we define the *tangent space* $T_p X$ of X at p to be

$$T_p X \coloneqq \ker(J_p).$$

For example, the tangent space $T_p X$ of a linear subspace $X \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ at a point $p \in X$ can be identified with X itself. The tangent space of $O(n)$ at the identity e is simply the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{o}(n)$, the Lie algebra consisting of all $n \times n$ skew symmetric matrices [14].

Let $U \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be a subset. We define the *Zariski closure* $\overline{U}$ of U to be the common zero set of polynomials vanishing on U. Namely,

$$\overline{U} = \{x \in \mathbb{C}^n : f(x) = 0, f \in I(U)\}.$$

For example, the Zariski closure of $\mathbb{R}$ in $\mathbb{C}$ is the whose space $\mathbb{C}$. We remark that the Zariski closure could be much larger than the Euclidean closure. For example, the Euclidean closure of $\mathbb{R}$ in $\mathbb{C}$ is just itself.

Let $X \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ and $Y \subset \mathbb{C}^m$ be two algebraic subvarieties. We say a map $f : X \to Y$ is a *polynomial map* if f can be represented as

$$f(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = (f_1(x_1, \ldots, x_n), \ldots, f_m(x_1, \ldots, x_n)),$$

where $f_1, \ldots, f_m$ are polynomials in n variables. For example, we denote $\mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ by the space of all $n \times n$ matrices. It is clear that $\mathbb{C}^{n \times n} \cong \mathbb{C}^{n^2}$. Then the map

$$\rho_r : \underbrace{\mathbb{C}^{n \times n} \times \cdots \times \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}}_{r \text{ copies}} \to \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$$

defined by $\rho_r(A_1, \ldots, A_r) = A_1 \cdots A_r$ is a polynomial map. If $W_1, \ldots, W_r$ are algebraic subvarieties of $\mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$, then the restriction of ρ_r is, by definition, also a polynomial map.

We denote the set of all k dimensional linear subspaces of $\mathbb{C}^n$ by $\mathrm{Gr}(k, n)$ and call it the *Grassmannian of k planes in $\mathbb{C}^n$*. In particular, when $k = 1$, we have $\mathrm{Gr}(1, n) = \mathbb{P}^{n-1}$, the projective space. We say that a subset X of $\mathbb{P}^{n-1}$ is a *projective subvariety* if X is defined by homogeneous polynomials, i.e., there are homogeneous polynomials $F_1, \ldots, F_r \in \mathbb{C}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ such that

$$X = \{[p] \in \mathbb{P}^{n-1} : F_1(p) = \cdots = F_r(p) = 0\}.$$

Here $[p]$ is the element in $\mathbb{P}^{n-1}$, which corresponds to the line joining the origin and $p \in \mathbb{C}^n$. It is a fundamental fact [9, 11, 12, 13] that $\mathrm{Gr}(k,n)$ is a projective subvariety in $\mathbb{P}^{N-1}$ where $N = \binom{n}{k}$. Furthermore, $\mathrm{Gr}(k,n)$ is smooth, i.e., every point in $\mathrm{Gr}(k,n)$ is a smooth point, hence we can define the *tangent bundle* $T\,\mathrm{Gr}(k,n)$, whose fiber over a point $[W] \in \mathrm{Gr}(k,n)$ is simply the tangent space $T_{[W]}\,\mathrm{Gr}(k,n)$. We define

$$E \coloneqq \{([W], w) : [W] \in \mathrm{Gr}(k,n), w \in W\}$$

and a projection map $\pi : E \to \mathrm{Gr}(k,n)$

$$\pi([W], w) = [W].$$

It turns out that (E, π) is a vector bundle on $\mathrm{Gr}(k,n)$ [9, 11, 12, 13]. We say that E is the *tautological vector bundle on* $\mathrm{Gr}(k,n)$. By definition, the fiber $\pi^{-1}([W])$ over a point $[W] \in \mathrm{Gr}(k,n)$ is simply the vector space W.

Let X be an algebraic subvariety in $\mathbb{C}^n$. Let P be a property defined for points in X. We say that P is a *generic property* if there exists an algebraic subvariety $X_P \subsetneq X$ such that if $x \in X$ does not satisfy the property P, then $x \in X_P$. If the property P is understood, we say that $x \in X$ is a *generic point* if x satisfies the property P. For example, we can say that for a fixed hyperplane H in $\mathbb{C}^n$, a generic point in $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$ is not contained in H. A generic $n \times n$ matrix is invertible since matrices that are not invertible are defined by the vanishing of their determinants. We also say that for a fixed m plane L, a generic k plane intersects with L in a $m+k-n$ dimensional subspace. If $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$ is a generic point for property P, then by definition, the set of points in $\mathbb{C}^n$ that does not satisfy P is contained in an algebraic subvariety $X_P \subsetneq \mathbb{C}^n$. If we equip $\mathbb{C}^n$ with the Lebesgue measure, then it is clear that X_P always has measure zero. In other words, the set of generic points has the full measure.

In particular, when we say that a generic $n \times n$ matrix can be decomposed into the product of finitely many structured matrices, for example, Toeplitz matrices, we mean the set of all matrices which admit such a decomposition is an open dense subset (with the Zariski topology) of the space of all $n \times n$ matrices. For those who are not familiar with the notion of generic objects, one can replace "generic" by "random" to obtain the intuition, though this is not rigorous in mathematics.

3. General method

Let X be an algebraic subvariety of $\mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ which is closed under matrix multiplication, i.e., for any $A, B \in X$ we have $AB \in X$. Let r be a positive integer and let $W_1, \ldots, W_r$ be subvarieties of X. We consider a map

$$\rho_r : W^r \coloneqq W_1 \times \cdots \times W_r \to X$$

defined by the matrix multiplication

$$\rho_r(A_1, \ldots, A_r) = A_1 \cdots A_r.$$

We can rephrase the matrix decomposition problem in terms of ρ.

Question 3.1.

(1) Does there exist r such that ρ_r is a dominant map, i.e., $\overline{\rho_r(W^r)} = X$?
(2) Does there exist r such that ρ_r is a surjective map, i.e., $\rho_r(W^r) = X$?

Here the closure $\overline{\rho(W^r)}$ is the Zariski closure of $\rho(W^r)$ in X. In general, the fist question in Question 3.1 is weaker than the second. However, we will see later that with some assumptions on X and W, we can conclude that if ρ_r is dominant, $\rho_{r'}$ is surjective for some $r' \geq r$.

3.1. **Lower bound of r.** First, we can do a naive dimension counting to get a lower bound on r. To do this we need

Proposition 3.2. [9] *If $f : Y \to Z$ is a dominant polynomial map between two irreducible algebraic varieties, then* $\dim Y = \dim Z + \dim f^{-1}(z)$ *for a generic point $z \in Z$. In particular,* $\dim Y \geq \dim Z$.

Apply Proposition 3.2 to our case we obtain

Corollary 3.3. *If $\rho_r : W^r \to X$ is dominant, then*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{r} \dim W_i \geq \dim X. \tag{1}$$

Corollary 3.4. *If* $\dim W_1 = \cdots = \dim W_r = m$ *and ρ_r is dominant, then*

$$r \geq \lceil \frac{\dim X}{m} \rceil.$$

We say that an algebraic subvariety $W \subset \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ is a *cone* if $x \in W$ implies that $\lambda x \in W$ for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$. Assume that $W_1, \ldots, W_r \subset X$ are cones. For any $A \in X$ with a decomposition

$$A = A_1 \ldots A_r, \text{ where } A_1 \in W_1, \ldots, A_r \in W_r,$$

$\rho_r^{-1}(A)$ contains the subvariety

$$Z_A = \{(\lambda_1 A_1, \ldots, \lambda_r A_r) \in W^r : \lambda_i \in \mathbb{C}, \prod_{i=1}^{r} \lambda_i = 1\}.$$

It is clear from the definition of Z_A that

$$\dim Z_A = r - 1.$$

Apply Proposition 3.2 to this case we obtain

Corollary 3.5. *If $W_1, \ldots, W_r$ are cones and $\rho_r : W^r \to X$ is dominant, then*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{r} \dim W_i - (r-1) \geq \dim X.$$

Corollary 3.6. *If $W_1, \ldots, W_r$ are cones of the same dimension m and ρ_r is dominant, then*

$$r \geq \lceil \frac{\dim X - 1}{m - 1} \rceil.$$

3.2. **Criterion for dominant maps.**

Proposition 3.7. *Let r be an integer and $W_1, \ldots, W_r$ be subvarieties of X. If there is a point $a = (A_1, \ldots, A_r) \in W^r$ such that the differential*

$$d\rho_r|_a : T_{A_1} W_1 \times \cdots \times T_{A_r} W_r \to T_{\rho(a)} X$$

has full rank $\dim X$*, then the map ρ_r is dominant.*

Proof. Suppose that $\overline{\rho_r(W^r)}$ is not equal to X, then it is a proper subvariety of X and hence it has dimension strictly smaller than that of X. Therefore, we have that the rank of $d\rho_r|_{a'}$ is strictly smaller than $\dim X$ for generic $a' \in W^r$. However, the assumption that there exists some $a \in W^r$ such that $d\rho_r|_a$ has the maximal rank implies that for a generic point $a' \in W^r$, we must have that the rank of $d\rho_r|_{a'}$ is equal to $\dim X$. □

For readers unfamiliar with the calculation of the differential $d\rho_r|_a$, we record the following formula

$$d\rho_r|_a(X_1, \ldots, X_r) = \sum_{i=1}^{r} A_1 \cdots A_{i-1} X_i A_{i+1} \cdots A_r, \tag{2}$$

where $X_i \in T_{A_i} W_i$. If in particular W_i is a linear subspace of $\mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$, then we may identify the tangent space $T_{A_i} W_i$ as W_i itself. We will apply formula (2) repeatedly the the rest of this paper.

3.3. **Criterion for surjective maps.**

Proposition 3.8. [2] *Let G be a topological group and let U be an open dense subset of G. Assume that U contains the identity element of the group G. Then*

$$G = U \cdot U,$$

i.e, every element $g \in G$ is of the form hh' for some $h, h' \in U$.

Theorem 3.9 (open mapping theorem)**.** [7] *Let X, Y be two irreducible varieties and let $f : X \to Y$ be a polynomial map. If f is dominant then there is some $U \subset f(X)$ which is open and dense in Y.*

Proposition 3.10. *Let $W_1 = \cdots = W_r = W$ be a linear subspace and $X = \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$. Suppose that W contains all diagonal matrices and that ρ_r is dominant. Then the map*

$$\rho_{r'} : W^{r'} \coloneqq \underbrace{W \times \cdots \times W}_{r' \text{ copies}} \to \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$$

defined by matrix multiplication is surjective for $r' = 4r + 1$.

Proof. Since ρ_r is dominant, by Theorem 3.9 its image

$$\rho_r(W^r) \coloneqq \underbrace{W \times \cdots \times W}_{r \text{ copies}}$$

contains an open dense subset of $\mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$. This implies that $\rho_r(W^r)$ contains an open dense subset of the group $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ because $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ is an open dense subset of $\mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$. By Proposition 3.8 we see that

$$\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{C}) \subseteq \rho_r(W^r) \cdot \rho_r(W^r).$$

Lastly, if $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ then there exists $P, Q \in \mathrm{GL}_n$ and a diagonal matrix $D \in \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ such that

$$A = PDQ.$$

Hence we see that

$$\mathbb{C}^{n\times n} \subseteq \rho_r(W^r) \cdot W \cdot \rho_r(W^r)$$

□

3.4. **Our strategy.** Let X be an algebraic subvariety of $\mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ which is closed under matrix multiplication and let $W_1, \ldots, W_r$ be r algebraic subvarieties of X. We define

$$\rho_r : W^r \coloneqq W_1 \times \cdots W_r \to X.$$

In general, we may answer Question 3.1 by the following strategy.

(1) We first calculate the lower bound r_0 of r for ρ_r to be dominant according to Corollaries 3.4, 3.5 and 3.6. If $r < r_0$ then ρ_r can not be dominant.
(2) If $r \geq r_0$, we calculate the differential $d\rho_r|_a$ of ρ_r at a point $a \in W^r$. If $d\rho_r|_a$ has the maximal rank $\dim X$ then ρ_r is dominant by Proposition 3.7.
(3) If $W_1 = \cdots = W_r = W$ is a linear subspace of $X = \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ containing all diagonal matrices and ρ_r is dominant then by Proposition 3.10 $\rho_{r'}$ is surjective where $r' = 4r + 1$.

The main step in our strategy is to find a point $a \in W^r$ such that the differential of ρ_r at a has the rank $\dim X$. The rest of this paper is concentrating on applying the above strategy to answer Question 3.1 for various choices of W_i and X.

4. Toy examples: LU and QR decompositions

In this section, we will discuss the matrix decomposition for two factors, which is the simplest case. We can recover the existence of LU and QR decompositions for a generic matrix using our method.

We know that a generic matrix has the LU decomposition and every matrix has the QR decomposition. Although the existence of the LU decomposition and the QR decomposition is quit elementary and clear from the linear algebra point of view, it is interesting to recover it from other point of view. In fact, we will prove a more general result.

Theorem 4.1. *Let W_1 and W_2 be two algebraic subvarieties of $\mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ such that*

(1) both W_1 and W_2 contain the identity matrix I_n as a smooth point, and
(2) $T_{I_n}W_1 + T_{I_n}W_2 = \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$.

Then a generic $n \times n$ matrix is a product of some $A_1 \in W_1$ and $A_2 \in W_2$. Moreover, every $n \times n$ matrix M is a product of some $A_1, B_1, C_1, D_1 \in W_1$, $A_2, B_2, C_2, D_2 \in W_2$ and a diagonal matrix E, i.e.,

$$M = A_1B_1A_2B_2EC_1C_2D_1D_2.$$

Here, by definition, we can identify the tangent space $T_{A_i}W_i$ at a smooth point A_i with a linear subspace in $\mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ for $i = 1, 2$.

Proof. Consider the differential $d\rho_2|_{(I_n,I_n)}$ of ρ_2 at (I_n, I_n), then by formula (2) we must have

$$d\rho_2|_{(I_n,I_n)}(X_1, X_2) = X_1 + X_2,$$

for any $X_i \in W_i, i = 1, 2$. By assumption we see that $d\rho_2|_{(I_n,I_n)}$ is surjective hence ρ_2 is dominant by Proposition 3.7. The moreover part follows from Proposition 3.10. □

Here we remind readers that by generic, we mean there are polynomials $F_1, \dots, F_r \in \mathbb{C}[x_{ij}]$ such that whenever $A = (a_{ij})$ is a matrix such that A cannot be expressed as a product of some $A_1 \in W_1$ and $A_2 \in W_2$, then we must have

$$F_1(A) = \cdots = F_r(A) = 0.$$

We warn readers that a generic matrix has a decomposition $A = A_1A_2$ for $A_i \in W_i, i = 1, 2$, does not imply that every matrix has such a decomposition. Intuitively speaking, a generic matrix has decomposition means "most" matrices admit such a decomposition. For example, a generic matrix has the LU decomposition but it is not true that every matrix has the LU decomposition. We will see this phenomenon again in Section 6.1, where we prove that a generic $n \times n$ matrix is a product of n companion matrices, but there exits $n \times n$ matrices that do not admit such a decomposition.

4.1. Triangular decomposition.

We apply Theorem 4.1 to the LU decomposition and its variants.

Corollary 4.2. *Let A be a generic $n \times n$ matrix. Then*

(1) There exist a lower triangular matrix L and an upper triangular matrix U such that

$$A = LU.$$

(2) There exist a lower triangular matrix L and an upper triangular matrix U such that

$$A = UL.$$

(3) There exist a top triangular matrix T and a bottom triangular matrix B such that

$$A = TB.$$

(4) There exist a top triangular matrix T and a bottom triangular matrix B such that

$$A = BT.$$

Remark 4.3. On the one hand, Corollary 4.2 does not specify what generic matrices are. It only guarantees that if we equip $\mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ with Lebesgue measure, the probability that a randomly picked $n \times n$ matrix can be written as the product of a lower triangular matrix and an upper triangular matrix is one. On the other hand, It is known [20] that a nonsingular matrix admit an LU decomposition if and only if all its leading principal minors are nonzero. This implies that a nonsingular matrix whose leading principal minors are all nonzero is a generic matrix in this case. However, we have more generic matrices, for example, matrices of rank k whose first k principal minors are nonzero are also generic matrices [20]. It is also known [21] that there exist $n\times n$ matrices which do not admit LU decompositions. Hence generic matrices for the LU decomposition form a proper subset of the space of $n \times n$ matrices.

Corollary 4.4. *Let A be an $n \times n$ matrix. Then*

(1) *There exist lower triangular matrices L_1, L_2, L_3, L_4 and upper triangular matrices U_1, U_2, U_3, U_4 such that*
$$A = L_1U_1L_2U_2L_3U_3L_4U_4.$$
(2) *There exist lower triangular matrices L_1, L_2, L_3, L_4 and upper triangular matrices U_1, U_2, U_3, U_4 such that*
$$A = U_1L_1U_2L_2U_3L_3U_4L_4.$$
(3) *There exist top triangular matrices T_1, T_2, T_3, T_4 and bottom triangular matrices B_1, B_2, B_3, B_4 such that*
$$A = T_1B_1T_2B_2T_3B_3T_4B_4.$$
(4) *There exist top triangular matrices T_1, T_2, T_3, T_4 and bottom triangular matrices B_1, B_2, B_3, B_4 such that*
$$A = B_1T_1B_2T_2B_3T_3B_4T_4.$$

4.2. **QR decompositions.** Assume $O(n)$ is the group of complex orthogonal matrices and let U be the space of upper triangular matrices. Since the tangent space of $O(n)$ at I_n is simply the linear space of all $n\times n$ skew symmetric matrices [14] and both $O(n)$ and U contain I_n as a smooth point, we can apply Theorem 4.1 directly to $O(n)$ and U

Corollary 4.5. *Let A be a generic $n \times n$ matrix. Then*

(1) *There exist an orthogonal matrix Q, an upper triangular matrix R such that*
$$A = RQ.$$
(2) *There exist an orthogonal matrix Q, an upper triangular matrix R such that*
$$A = QR.$$
(3) *There exist an orthogonal matrix Q, a lower triangular matrix S such that*
$$A = QS.$$
(4) *There exist an orthogonal matrix Q, a lower triangular matrix S such that*
$$A = SQ.$$

Corollary 4.6. *Let A be an $n \times n$ matrix. Then*

(1) *There exist orthogonal matrices Q_1, Q_2, Q_3, Q_4 and upper triangular matrices R_1, R_2, R_3, R_4 such that*
$$A = R_1Q_1R_2Q_2R_3Q_3R_4Q_4.$$
(2) *There exist orthogonal matrices Q_1, Q_2, Q_3, Q_4 and upper triangular matrices R_1, R_2, R_3, R_4 such that*
$$A = Q_1R_1Q_2R_2Q_3R_3Q_4R_4.$$

(3) *There exist orthogonal matrices Q_1, Q_2, Q_3, Q_4 and lower triangular matrices S_1, S_2, S_3, S_4 such that*
$$A = Q_1 S_1 Q_2 S_2 Q_3 S_3 Q_4 S_4.$$
(4) *There exist orthogonal matrices Q_1, Q_2, Q_3, Q_4 and lower triangular matrices S_1, S_2, S_3, S_4 such that*
$$A = S_1 Q_1 S_2 Q_2 S_3 Q_3 S_4 Q_4.$$

Remark 4.7. Corollary 4.6 is redundant because it is known that every $n \times n$ matrix admit a QR decomposition. Furthermore, this implies that generic matrices for QR decomposition in Corollary 4.5 are actually all matrices. Combining this fact with Remark 4.3, we see that generic matrices are not necessarily the same for different matrix decompositions.

One might ask whether or not the same method applies to the SVD, but unfortunately, since the SVD involves complex conjugation of a matrix, which makes the decomposition non-algebraic, we are not allowed to use the same argument to recover the SVD even for generic matrices.

5. Matrix decomposition for linear spaces

5.1. **Bidiagonal decomposition.** Let $A = (a_{ij})$ be an $n \times n$ matrix. We say that A is a *k-diagonal matrix* if
$$a_{ij} = 0 \text{ if } |i - j| \geq k.$$
In particular 1-diagonal matrices are simply diagonal matrices, 2-diagonal matrices are called bidiagonal matrices. For example, a 3×3 bidiagonal matrix is of the form
$$\begin{bmatrix} a & b & 0 \\ c & d & e \\ 0 & f & g \end{bmatrix}.$$
An *upper k-diagonal matrix* $A = (a_{ij})$ is a k-diagonal matrix with further restriction
$$a_{ij} = 0 \text{ if } i - j \geq 1.$$
A 3×3 upper bidiagonal matrix is of the form
$$\begin{bmatrix} a & b & 0 \\ 0 & c & d \\ 0 & 0 & e \end{bmatrix}.$$
A matrix A is called *lower k-diagonal* if A^{T} is upper k-diagonal. We denote the set of all k-diagonal matrices by D_k, the set of all upper k-diagonal matrices by $D_{k,\geq 0}$ and the set of all lower k-diagonal matrices by $D_{k,\leq 0}$.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $2 \leq k \leq n$ be an integer. A generic $n \times n$ upper (resp. lower) k-diagonal matrix is a product of $k-1$ upper (resp. lower) bidiagonal matrices. In particular, A generic $n \times n$ upper (resp. lower) matrix is a product of n upper (resp. lower) bidiagonal matrices.*

Proof. We will prove the lemma for upper triangular matrix case. For a positive integer $2 \leq k$, we recall that $D_{k,\geq 0}$ is the space of upper k-diagonal matrices. It is clear that the product of $k-1$ bidiagonal matrices is a k diagonal matrix. We want to show that the map
$$\rho_{k-1} : \underbrace{D_{2,\geq 0} \times \cdots \times D_{2,\geq 0}}_{k-1 \text{ copies}} \to D_{k,\geq 0}$$
defined by matrix multiplication is dominant. We proceed by induction on k. When $k = 2$, it is clear that ρ_1 is dominant. Assume that the map ρ_{k-1} is dominant where $k - 1 \leq n - 1$ then we need to prove that ρ_k is also dominant. To this end we can factor the map ρ_k as
$$\rho_k : D_{2,\geq 0} \times \underbrace{(D_{2,\geq 0} \times \cdots \times D_{2,\geq 0})}_{k-1 \text{ copies}} \xrightarrow{(\mathrm{Id}_n, \rho_{k-1})} D_{2,\geq 0} \times D_{k-1,\geq 0} \xrightarrow{\rho} D_{k+1,\geq 0},$$

where Id_n is the identity map on $D_{2,\geq 0}$ and ρ is the map defined by multiplication of two matrices. By the induction hypothesis, we see that $(\mathrm{Id}, \rho_{k-1})$ is dominant hence it is sufficient to show that ρ is dominant. Now to see that ρ is dominant, we calculate the differential of ρ. By formula (2) the differential of ρ at (A, B) is given by

$$d\rho|_{(A,B)}(X, Y) = XB + AY, \text{ for all } (X, Y) \in D_{2,\geq 0} \times D_{k-1,\geq 0}.$$

On the other hand, given any $C \in D_{k+1,\geq 0}$, we can write $C = C' + C''$ where $C' \in D_{k,\geq 0}$ and $C'' \in D_{k+1,\geq 0} - D_{k,\geq 0}$. We take $B = (\delta^i_{i+k-1}) \in D_{k,\geq 0}$, where δ^i_j is the Kronecker delta and $A = \mathrm{Id}_n$, then one can easily find $(X, Y) \in D_{2,\geq 0} \times D_{k,\geq 0}$ such that

$$XB = C'', Y = C'.$$

This implies that $d\rho|_{(A,B)}$ is surjective, and hence ρ is dominant by Proposition 3.7. □

Corollary 5.2. *Every invertible upper (resp. lower) triangular matrix is a product of $2n$ upper (resp. lower) bidiagonal matrices.*

Proof. Since a generic upper triangular matrix is a product of n upper bidiagonal matrices, the corollary follows from Proposition 3.8. □

Proposition 5.3. *A generic $n \times n$ matrix can be decomposed into a product of $2n$ tridiagonal matrices. An invertible $n \times n$ matrix is a product of $4n$ bidiagonal matrices.*

Proof. By Lemma 5.1 a generic upper (resp. lower) triangular matrix is a product of n upper (resp. lower) bidiagonal matrices. A generic $n \times n$ matrix has an LU decomposition. Hence we see that a generic matrix can be decomposed as a product of n upper and n lower bidiagonal matrices. The last statement follows from 3.8. □

Theorem 5.4. *Let r be the smallest number such that every $n \times n$ matrix is a product of r bidiagonal matrices. Then*

$$n - 1 \leq r \leq 8n.$$

Proof. Notice that every matrix A can be written as

$$A = PDQ,$$

where P, Q are invertible and D is diagonal. By Proposition 5.3 we see that P, Q are products of $8n$ bidiagonal matrices, respectively. Since diagonal matrices are also bidiagonal, we see that every $n \times n$ matrix is a product of $8n$ bidiagonal matrices. This gives the upper bound of r. For the lower bound, we simply notice that a product of $k - 1$ bidiagonal matrices is k-diagonal hence r must be at least $n - 1$. □

Since $\dim D_2 = 3n - 2$, by Corollary 3.6 the expected value of r is $\lceil \frac{n+1}{3} \rceil$, while the lower bound of r is $n - 1$. This shows that Proposition 5.4 gives us an example that the expected value may not be achieved. Roughly speaking, this is because entries on the diagonal of a tridiagonal matrix do not contribute to expand the product. To be more precise, if X is a diagonal matrix and Y is a bidiagonal matrix then XY is still a bidiagonal matrix.

5.2. **Skew symmetric decomposition.** We consider skew symmetric matrix decomposition problem in this section. An $n \times n$ skew symmetric matrix A is defined by the condition

$$A = -A^{\mathsf{T}}.$$

We denote the space of all $n \times n$ skew symmetric matrices by Λ_n. It is clear that Λ_n is a linear subspace of $\mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ and

$$\dim(\Lambda_n) = \binom{n}{2}.$$

On the one hand, since $\lceil \frac{n^2-1}{\binom{n}{2}-1} \rceil = 3$ if $n \geq 3$, we see that if the map

$$\rho_r : \underbrace{\Lambda_n \times \cdots \times \Lambda_n}_{r \text{ copies}} \to \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$$

is dominant then r is at least three. On the other hand, from the definition one can see that for any $A \in \Lambda_n$ we have

$$\det(A) = \det(A^{\mathsf{T}}) = (-1)^n \det(A).$$

In particular if n is odd, we obtain $\det(A) = 0$. This implies that when n is odd, the map ρ can never be dominant, regardless how large r is. However, when n is odd, we can expect that

$$\rho_r : \underbrace{\Lambda_n \times \cdots \times \Lambda_n}_{r \text{ copies}} \to \mathrm{DET_n}$$

is dominant for $r \geq 3$, where $\mathrm{DET_n}$ is the hypersurface of all $n \times n$ matrices whose determinants are zero.

Proposition 5.5. *We have the following two cases:*

1. *n is even. A generic $n \times n$ matrix is a product of r skew symmetric matrices for (n, r) where*
   - *(a) $n \geq 8$, $r \geq 3$ or*
   - *(b) $n = 6, r \geq 4$ or*
   - *(c) $n = 4, r \geq 5$.*
2. *n is odd. A generic $n \times n$ matrix is a product of r skew symmetric matrices whose determinants are zero for (n, r) where*
   - *(a) $n \geq 5$, $r \geq 3$ or*
   - *(b) $n = 3, r \geq 4$.*

Again, we consider the map

$$\rho_r : \underbrace{\Lambda_n \times \cdots \times \Lambda_n}_{r \text{ copies}} \to \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}, \text{ when } n \text{ is even, and}$$

$$\rho_r : \underbrace{\Lambda_n \times \cdots \times \Lambda_n}_{r \text{ copies}} \to \mathrm{DET_n}, \text{ when } n \text{ is odd.}$$

Example 5.6. Using Macalay2 [22] we can calculate the dimension d of the closure of the image of ρ for small n and r, we list some results

1. $n = 2$, $d = 1$ for any r.
2. $(n, r) = (3, 3)$, $d = 7$.
3. $(n, r) = (3, 4)$, $d = 8$, $\overline{\mathrm{im}(\rho_r)} = \mathrm{DET}_3$.
4. $(n, r) = (4, 3)$, $d = 13$.
5. $(n, r) = (4, 4)$, $d = 15$, $\overline{\mathrm{im}(\rho_r)}$ is a hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^{16}$.
6. $(n, r) = (4, 5)$, $d = 16$, $\overline{\mathrm{im}(\rho_r)} = \mathbb{C}^{16}$.
7. $(n, r) = (5, 3), (7, 3), (9, 3)$ or $(11, 3)$, $d = n^2 - 1$, $\overline{\mathrm{im}(\rho_r)} = \mathrm{DET}_n$.
8. $(n, r) = (6, 3)$, $d = 35$, $\overline{\mathrm{im}(\rho_r)}$ is a hypersurface in $\mathbb{C}^{36}$.
9. $(n, r) = (6, 4)$, $d = 36$, $\overline{\mathrm{im}(\rho_r)} = \mathbb{C}^{36}$.
10. $(n, r) = (8, 3), (10, 3), (12, 3)$ or $(14, 3)$, $d = n^2$, $\overline{\mathrm{im}(\rho_r)} = \mathbb{C}^{n^2}$.

Proof of Proposition 5.5. It left to show that ρ_r is dominant for $n \geq 16, r = 3$ when n is even (resp. $n \geq 13, r = 3$ when n is odd). We may proceed by induction on n.

Case 1. We assume $n \geq 16$ is even, We consider three block diagonal matrices

$$\begin{bmatrix} A & O \\ O & A' \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} B & O \\ O & B' \end{bmatrix}, \text{ and } \begin{bmatrix} C & O \\ O & C' \end{bmatrix},$$

where A, B, C are $(n-8)\times(n-8)$ skew symmetric matrices, and A', B', C' are 8×8 skew symmetric matrices such that differentials of

$$\rho_3^{(n-8)} : \Lambda_{n-8}\times\Lambda_{n-8}\times\Lambda_{n-8}\to\mathbb{C}^{(n-8)\times(n-8)} \text{ and}$$
$$\rho_3^{(8)} : \Lambda_8\times\Lambda_8\times\Lambda_8\to\mathbb{C}^{8\times 8}$$

are surjective at (A, B, C) and (A', B', C'), respectively. We consider the differential of

$$\rho_3 : \Lambda_n\times\Lambda_n\times\Lambda_n\to\mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$$

at

$$a=\begin{bmatrix}A & O\\ O & A'\end{bmatrix}, b=\begin{bmatrix}B & O\\ O & B'\end{bmatrix}, \text{ and } c=\begin{bmatrix}C & O\\ O & C'\end{bmatrix}.$$

We parametrize tangent spaces of Λ_n at a, b and c by

$$x=\begin{bmatrix}X & u\\ -u^{\mathsf{T}} & X'\end{bmatrix}, y=\begin{bmatrix}Y & v\\ -v^{\mathsf{T}} & Y'\end{bmatrix}, \text{ and } z=\begin{bmatrix}Z & w\\ -w^{\mathsf{T}} & Z'\end{bmatrix}.$$

Then we have by formula (2)

$$\begin{aligned} d\rho_{3|(a,b,c)}(x,y,z) &= ab\begin{bmatrix}Z & w\\ -w^{\mathsf{T}} & Z'\end{bmatrix}+a\begin{bmatrix}Y & v\\ -v^{\mathsf{T}} & Y'\end{bmatrix}c+\begin{bmatrix}X & u\\ -u^{\mathsf{T}} & X'\end{bmatrix}bc\\ &=\begin{bmatrix}ABZ+AYC+XBC & ABw+AvC'+uB'C'\\ -A'B'w^{\mathsf{T}}-A'v^{\mathsf{T}}C-u^{\mathsf{T}}BC & A'B'Z'+A'Y'C'+X'B'C'\end{bmatrix}.\end{aligned}$$

By choice of A, B, C and A', B', C' we know that $ABZ+AYC+XBC$ can be any $(n-8)\times(n-8)$ matrix and that $A'B'Z'+A'Y'C'+X'B'C'$ can be any 8×8 matrix. Lastly, it is clear that $ABw+AvC'+uB'C'$ and -$A'B'w^{\mathsf{T}}-A'v^{\mathsf{T}}C-u^{\mathsf{T}}BC$ can be any $(n-8)\times 8$ and $8\times(n-8)$ matrix, respectively. This shows that $d\rho_{3|(a,b,c)}$ is surjective hence ρ is dominant.

Case 2. We assume $n\geq 13$ is odd. Then we can choose

$$a=\begin{bmatrix}A & O\\ O & A'\end{bmatrix}, b=\begin{bmatrix}B & O\\ O & B'\end{bmatrix}, \text{ and } c=\begin{bmatrix}C & O\\ O & C'\end{bmatrix}.$$

where A, B, C are $(n-5)\times(n-5)$ skew symmetric matrices and A', B', C' are 5×5 skew symmetric matrices such that

$$\rho_3^{(n-5)} : \Lambda_{n-5}\times\Lambda_{n-5}\times\Lambda_{n-5}\to\mathbb{C}^{(n-5)\times(n-5)} \text{ and}$$
$$\rho_3^{(5)} : \Lambda_5\times\Lambda_5\times\Lambda_5\to \mathrm{DET}_5$$

are dominant at (A, B, C) and (A', B', C') respectively. The similar calculation as in the previous case shows that ρ_3 is dominant.

□

We remark that when $n=2$, a skew symmetric matrix is of the form

$$\begin{bmatrix}0 & a\\ -a & 0\end{bmatrix}, a\in\mathbb{C}.$$

Therefore, we see that if r is even, the image of ρ_r is simply the space of all 2×2 diagonal matrices, and if r is odd, the image of ρ_r is the space of skew symmetric matrices.

By Proposition 3.10 we can derive from 5.5 the following

Theorem 5.7. *For $n\geq 4$, every $2n\times 2n$ matrix is a product of 13 skew symmetric matrices. Every 6×6 matrix is a product of 17 skew symmetric matrices. Every 4×4 matrix is a product of 21 skew symmetric matrices.*

Notice that we are not able to apply Proposition 3.10 when n is odd. This is because the image of ρ_r is contained in DET_n, which does not contain the group of invertible matrices.

5.3. **Symmetric Toeplitz matrix decomposition.** A symmetric Toeplitz matrix $A = (a_{ij})$ is defined by

$$a_{ij} = a_{i+p,j+p}, a_{ij} = a_{ji}, 1 \leq i, j, i+p, j+p \leq n.$$

We denote the space of all symmetric Toeplitz matrices by ST_n. A centrosymmetric matrix $B = (b_{ij})$ is defined by

$$b_{ij} = a_{n-i+1,n-j+1}, 1 \leq i, j \leq n.$$

It is easy to verify that the product of two centrosymmetric matrices is again a centrosymmetric matrix hence the space CS_n of all centrosymmetric matrices is an algebra. Moreover, we have

$$ST_n \subset CS_n.$$

We say that a matrix A is a persymmetric Hankel if JA is a symmetric Hankel, where

$$J = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & \cdot & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

We denote the space of all $n \times n$ persymmetric Hanekl matrices by PH_n. It is clear that $PH_n \subset CS_n$.

We will consider symmetric Toepliz (resp. persymmetric Hankel) matrix decomposition problem of a centrosymmetric matrix. It is clear that

$$\dim(ST_n) = \dim(PH_n) = n, \dim(CS_n) = \lceil \frac{n^2}{2} \rceil.$$

Hence by Corollary 3.6 we see that if

$$\rho_r : \underbrace{ST_n \times \cdots \times ST_n}_{r \text{ copies}} \to CS_n \quad \text{or}$$

$$\rho_r : \underbrace{PH_n \times \cdots \times PH_n}_{r \text{ copies}} \to CS_n$$

is dominant, then

$$r \geq \frac{\lceil \frac{n^2}{2} \rceil - 1}{n-1} = \begin{cases} \lfloor \frac{n+1}{2} \rfloor, & \text{if } n \geq 3, \\ 1, & \text{if } n = 2. \end{cases}$$

Proposition 5.8. *Let $n \geq 3$ be an integer. A generic $n \times n$ centrosymmetric matrix is a product of $\lfloor \frac{n+1}{2} \rfloor$ symmetric Toepitz (resp. persymmetric Hankel) matrices.*

The proof of Proposition 5.8 is similar to the proof of Toeplitz matrix decomposition theorem [8] hence we will just give a sketch of the proof for Proposition 5.8 here.

Sketch of proof of Proposition 5.8. It is sufficient to prove the statement for symmetric Toeplitz. Indeed, since we have

$$JA = AJ, J^2 = 1.$$

if A is symmetric Toeplitz, if $X \in CS_n$ has a decomposition

$$X = A_1 \cdots A_r$$

where $A_1, \ldots, A_r \in ST_n$ and $r = \lfloor \frac{n+1}{2} \rfloor$. Then we see that

$$JX = J(A_1 \cdots A_r) = (JA_1) \cdots (JA_r),$$

if r is odd and

$$X = (JA_1) \cdots (JA_r),$$

if r is even. In either case, this implies that a generic centrosymmetric matrix is a product of r persymmetric Hankel matrices.

Let $B_k \coloneqq (\delta_{i,j+k})_{i,j=1}^n, k = -(n-1), -(n-2), \ldots, n-1$ be a basis of the linear space of all $n \times n$ Toeplitz matrices. Then $S_k \coloneqq \frac{1}{1+\delta_{k,-k}}(B_k + B_{-k}), k = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1$ is a basis of ST_n. Precisely, we have

$$B_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & \ddots & \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \ddots & 0 \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ & & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, B_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \ddots & \\ & 0 & 1 & \ddots & 0 \\ & & 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ & & & \ddots & 1 \\ & & & & 0 \end{bmatrix}, B_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & \ddots & \\ & 0 & 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ & & 0 & \ddots & 1 \\ & & & \ddots & 0 \\ & & & & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \ldots, B_{n-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & \ddots & 1 \\ & 0 & 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ & & 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ & & & \ddots & 0 \\ & & & & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

and

$$S_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & \ddots & \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \ddots & 0 \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ & & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, S_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \ddots & \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & 1 \\ & & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, S_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & \ddots & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & \ddots & 1 \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ & & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \ldots, S_{n-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & \ddots & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \ddots & 0 \\ & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ 1 & & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

To prove that ρ_r is dominant, it suffices to find a point $a \coloneqq (A_{n-r}, \ldots, A_{n-1}) \in \underbrace{ST_n \times \cdots \times ST_n}_{r \text{ copies}}$ such that the differential of ρ_r at a has the maximal rank $\lceil \frac{n^2}{2} \rceil$. In stead of choosing a point a explicitly, we will show that such a point exits. To this end, we write

$$A_{n-i} \coloneqq S_0 + t_{n-i} S_{n-i}, i = 1, 2, \ldots, r,$$

where $t_{n-1}, \ldots, t_{n-r}$ are indeterminants. For such A_{n-i} we see that the differential $d\rho_r|_a$ can be represented as an $\lceil \frac{n^2}{2} \rceil \times rn$ matrix M, whose entries are polynomials in $t_{n-1}, \ldots, t_{n-r}$. Now to see that M has rank $\lceil \frac{n^2}{2} \rceil$, we need to find a nonzero $\lceil \frac{n^2}{2} \rceil \times \lceil \frac{n^2}{2} \rceil$ minor of M.

Claim 5.9. *By the same type of argument as in* [8]*, we can show*

1. *Any $\lceil \frac{n^2}{2} \rceil \times \lceil \frac{n^2}{2} \rceil$ of M is a polynomial in t's of degree at least $\lceil \frac{n^2}{2} \rceil - n$.*
2. *There exists a $\lceil \frac{n^2}{2} \rceil \times \lceil \frac{n^2}{2} \rceil$ minor of M contains a monomial of degree exactly $\lceil \frac{n^2}{2} \rceil - n$ and whose coefficient is non-zero. Indeed, the desired monomial is $t_{n-1}^{n-1} t_{n-2}^{n-1} \cdots t_{n-r+1}^{n-1}$ if n is odd, and $t_{n-1}^{n-1} t_{n-2}^{n-1} \cdots t_{n-r+2}^{n-1} t_{n-r+1}^{\frac{n}{2}-1}$ if n is even.*

This shows that for a fixed n, there exist some values of $t_{n-1}, \ldots, t_{n-r}$ such that the differential $d\rho_r|_a$ has the maximal rank $\lceil \frac{n^2}{2} \rceil$. □

We work out an example to illustrate how the proof of Proposition 5.8 works. We adopt notations in [8]. For the map

$$\rho_r : \underbrace{ST_n \times \cdots \times ST_n}_{r \text{ copies}} \to CS_n,$$

we define

$$X_{n-i} \coloneqq \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} x_{n-i,k} S_k, i = 1, 2, \ldots, r$$

to be the matrix occuring in the i-th argument of ρ_r. Then by formula (2), the differential $d\rho_r|a$ is simply a linear map defined by

$$d\rho_r|a(X_{n-r}, \ldots, X_{n-1}) = \sum_{i=1}^{r} A_{n-r} \cdots A_{n-i-1} X_{n-i} A_{n-i+1} \cdots A_{n-1},$$

for $X_{n-i} \in ST_n$. We denote the entries of $d\rho_r|a(X_{n-r}, \ldots, X_{n-1})$ by $L_{p,q}, 1 \le p, q \le n$. Then it is clear that the matrix $(L_{p,q})$ is a centrosymmetric matrix, i.e,

$$L_{p,q} = L_{n-p+1,n-q+1}, 1 \le p, q \le n.$$

We

Case 1. We consider the case $n = 3$. This gives

$$r = \lfloor \frac{n+1}{2} \rfloor = 2, \lceil \frac{n^2}{2} \rceil = 5.$$

We will see that any 5×5 minor of the 5×6 matrix M is a polynomial in t's of degree at least 3. We can simply write

$$L_{p,q} = x_{1,q-p} + x_{2,q-p} + \Omega(t), p, q = 1, 2, 3.$$

Here $\Omega(t)$ stands for terms of $L_{p,q}$ of degree at least one in t's. With this notation, we express M as

$$\begin{array}{c} \\ L_{3,3}{=}L_{1,1} \\ L_{3,2}{=}L_{1,2} \\ L_{3,1}{=}L_{1,3} \\ L_{2,2} \\ L_{2,1}{=}L_{23} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{cccccc} x_{1,2} & x_{2,2} & x_{1,1} & x_{1,0} & x_{2,0} & x_{2,1} \end{array} \\ \begin{bmatrix} * & * & * & 1 & 1 & * \\ * & * & 1 & * & * & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & * & * & * & * \\ * & * & * & 1 & 1 & * \\ * & * & 1 & * & * & 1 \end{bmatrix} \end{array}.$$

Here means that the entry if of the form $\Omega(t)$ and 1 means that the corresponding $L_{p,q}$ contains $x_{1,k}$ or x_k. For example, since $L_{3,3} = L_{1,1}$ is of the form

$$x_{1,0} + x_{2,0} + \Omega(t),$$

we put 1 in $(1, 4)$-th and $(1, 5)$-th entry of M and $*$ elsewhere in the first row. It is not hard to see that any 5×5 minor of M has degree at least $5 - 3 = 2$. This verifies the first statement of Claim 5.9.

Case 2. Next, we consider the case $n = 5$. In this case we have

$$r = \lfloor \frac{n+1}{2} \rfloor = 3, \lceil \frac{n^2}{2} \rceil = 13.$$

We consider the table

$L_{i,j}$	1	2	3	4	5
1	t_4	t_3	1	1	1
2	t_4	t_3	1	t_3	t_4'
3			1	t_3	t_4

indicating the way we obtain $t_4^4 t_3^4$. Namely, we pick t_4 from $L_{1,1}, L_{2,1}, L_{2,5}$ and $L_{3,5}$. We pick t_3 from $L_{1,2}, L_{2,3}, L_{2,4}$ and $L_{3,4}$ and one form rest five L_{ij}'s. By definition of L_{ij}, we see that this is the unique way to obtain the monomial $t_4^4 t_3^4$. This verifies the second statement of Claim 5.9.

5.4. **Generic matrix decomposition.** In this section we consider the decomposition problem for generic linear subspaces of $\mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$. Let r be a positive integer. Assume that for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, r$, W_i is a k_i dimensional subspace of $\mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$. We define

$$W^r \coloneqq W_1 \times \cdots \times W_r.$$

Let $\rho_r : W^r \to \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ be the map sending $(A_1, \ldots, A_r)$ to their product $A_1 \cdots A_r$. We want to determine r, such that ρ_r is dominant. Consider the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} TE_1 \times \cdots \times TE_r & \xrightarrow{d\hat{\rho_r}} & T\operatorname{Gr}(k_1, n^2) \times \cdots \times T\operatorname{Gr}(k_r, n^2) \times \mathbb{C}^{n\times n} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ E_1 \times \cdots \times E_r & \xrightarrow{\hat{\rho_r}} & \operatorname{Gr}(k_1, n^2) \times \cdots \times \operatorname{Gr}(k_r, n^2) \times \mathbb{C}^{n\times n} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \operatorname{Gr}(k_1, n^2) \times \cdots \times \operatorname{Gr}(k_r, n^2) & \xrightarrow{\text{id}} & \operatorname{Gr}(k_1, n^2) \times \cdots \times \operatorname{Gr}(k_r, n^2). \end{array}$$

Here E_i is the tautological vector bundle over $\mathrm{Gr}(k_i, n^2)$, TE_i is the tangent bundle of E_i, and $\hat{\rho}_r$ is the bundle map induced by $\rho_r : W^r \to \mathbb{C}^{n^2}$, and $d\hat{\rho}_r$ is the differential of $\hat{\rho}_r$.

To be more precise, for any $[W_i] \in \mathrm{Gr}(k_i, n^2)$, the fiber $E_{[W_i]}$ over $[W_i]$ is W_i and the fiber of TE_i over $([W_i], A_i)$ is $T_{[W_i]}\mathrm{Gr}(k_i, n^2) \oplus W_i$, where $A_i \in W_i$. If we restrict $\hat{\rho}_r$ to the fiber $E_{[W_1]} \times \cdots \times E_{[W_r]}$ we obtain the map $\rho_r : W^r \to \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ defined before and the restriction of $d\hat{\rho}_r$ to $TE_{1([W_1],A_1)} \times \cdots \times TE_{r([W_r],A_r)}$ becomes the differential of ρ_r at the point $(A_1, \ldots, A_r)$.

Lemma 5.10. *Let r be a positive integer. For each $i = 1, \ldots, r$, let k_i be a fixed integer such that $1 \leq k_i \leq n^2$. Assume that $\rho_r : W^r \to \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ is dominant for some k_i dimensional subspace W_i of $\mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, r$. Then for a generic k_i-dimensional subspace W_i' of $\mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$, the map $\rho_r : W'^r \to \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ is dominant, where*

$$W'^r \coloneqq W'_1 \times \cdots \times W'_r.$$

Proof. Since $\rho_r : W^r \to \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ is dominant, we see that the Jacobian matrix of ρ_r at a generic point $(A_1, \ldots, A_r)$ in W^r has the maximal rank, i.e., the Jacobian matrix of $\hat{\rho}_r$ at $([W_1], A_1) \times \cdots \times ([W_r], A_r)$ has the maximal rank. By Proposition 3.7 we see that $\hat{\rho}_r$ is dominant, i.e., ρ_r is dominant for generic $W'_i \in \mathrm{Gr}(k_i, n^2)$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots, r$. □

We shall make use of the following result

Proposition 5.11. [8] *A generic $n \times n$ matrix can be decomposed as the product of $\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor + 1$ Toeplitz matrices.*

Proposition 5.12. *Let $\mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ be the space of all $n \times n$ matrices then*

(i) *For generic $(2n-1)$ dimensional subspaces $W_1, \ldots, W_r$ of $\mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$, a generic $n \times n$ matrix is a product of elements in $W_i, i = 1, 2, \ldots, r$ if $r \geq \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor + 1$.*

(ii) *For generic $\binom{n+1}{2}$ dimensional subspaces $W_1, \ldots, W_r$ of $\mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$, a generic $n \times n$ matrix is a product of elements in $W_i, i = 1, 2, \ldots, r$ if $r \geq 2$.*

(iii) *For generic $(3n-2)$ dimensional subspaces $W_1, \ldots, W_r$ of $\mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$, a generic $n \times n$ matrix is a product of elements in $W_i, i = 1, 2, \ldots, r$ if $r \geq 2n$.*

(iv) *For generic $\binom{2n}{2}$ dimensional subspaces $W_1, \ldots, W_r$ of $\mathbb{C}^{2n\times 2n}$, a generic $n \times n$ matrix is a product of elements in $W_i, i = 1, 2, \ldots, r$ if*
   (a) $r \geq 3$ when $n \geq 4$,
   (b) $r \geq 4$ when $n = 3$,
   (c) $r \geq 5$ when $n = 2$.

Proof. The first statement follows from Proposition 5.11 and Lemma 5.10. The second statement follows from Corollary 4.2 and Lemma 5.10. The third statement follows from Proposition 5.3 and Lemma 5.10. The last statement follows from Proposition 5.5 and Lemma Lemma 5.10. □

The combination of Proposition 3.10 and Proposition 5.12 implies

Theorem 5.13. *Let $\mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ be the space of all $n \times n$ matrices then*

(i) *For generic $(2n-1)$ dimensional subspaces $W_1, \ldots, W_r$ of $\mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$, an $n \times n$ matrix is a product of elements in $W_i, i = 1, 2 \ldots, r$ if $r \geq 2n + 5$.*

(ii) *For generic $\binom{n+1}{2}$ dimensional subspaces $W_1, \ldots, W_r$ of $\mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$, an $n \times n$ matrix is a product of elements in $W_i, i = 1, 2 \ldots, r$ if $r \geq 9$.*

(iii) *For generic $(3n-2)$ dimensional subspaces $W_1, \ldots, W_r$ of $\mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$, an $n \times n$ matrix is a product of elements in $W_i, i = 1, 2 \ldots, r$ if $r \geq 8n + 1$.*

(iv) *For generic $\binom{2n}{2}$ dimensional subspaces $W_1, \ldots, W_r$ of $\mathbb{C}^{2n\times 2n}$, an $n \times n$ matrix is a product of elements in $W_i, i = 1, 2 \ldots, r$ if*
   (a) $r \geq 13$ when $n \geq 4$,
   (b) $r \geq 17$ when $n = 3$,
   (c) $r \geq 21$ when $n = 2$.

We close this section by remarking that Proposition 5.12 (resp. Theorem 5.13) only hold for generic subspaces $W_1, \ldots, W_r$ of $\mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$, i.e., there is a proper algebraic subvariety $Z_i \subset \mathrm{Gr}(k_i, n^2)$ such that if

$$(W_1, \ldots, W_r) \in (\mathrm{Gr}(k_1, n^2) - Z_1) \times \cdots \times (\mathrm{Gr}(k_r, n^2) - Z_r),$$

then $\rho_r : W_1 \times \cdots \times W_r \to \mathbb{C}^2$ is dominant (resp. surjective). However, we do not know any information about algebraic subvarieties Z_i. The main contribution of Proposition 5.12 and Theorem 5.13 is that if the matrix decomposition (both dominant and surjective versions) holds for some $W_1, \ldots, W_r$ then it also holds for almost all linear subspaces W_i' of dimensions $\dim W_i, i = 1, 2, \ldots, r$, respectively.

6. Matrix decomposition for nonlinear spaces

We consider matrix decompositions for non-linear algebraic subvarieties in this section. In 6.1 we discuss the matrix decomposition into the product of companion matrices and in 6.2 we discuss the matrix decomposition for generalized Vandermonde matrices.

6.1. **Companion decomposition.** An $n \times n$ companion matrix is a matrix of the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & c_1 \\ 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & c_2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & c_n \end{bmatrix},$$

where $c_1, \ldots, c_n$ are arbitrary complex numbers. We denote C_n by the set of all companion matrices. Then it is clear that C_n is an affine varitey of dimension n.

Proposition 6.1. *A generic $n \times n$ matrix is a product of n companion matrices*

Proof. We need to prove that the map

$$\rho_n : \underbrace{C_n \times \cdots \times C_n}_{n \text{ copies}} \to \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$$

is dominant. Let σ be the matrix corresponding to the permutation $(12\ldots n)$, i.e., σ is the matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

For an $n \times n$ matrix A the matrix σA is obtained by shifting the i-th row of A to the $(i+1)$-th row, $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Similarly, the matrix $A\sigma$ is obtained by shifting the i-th column of A to the $(i-1)$-th column, $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Here we adopt the convention that the $n+1$-th row is actually the first row and the 0-th column is actually the n-th column.

We calculate the rank of $d\rho_n$ at the point $(\sigma, \cdots, \sigma)$. First notice that the tangent space $T_\sigma C_n$ of C_n at σ is the linear space consisting of matrices of the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \cdots & c_1 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & c_2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & c_n \end{bmatrix},$$

where $c_1, \ldots, c_n$ are arbitrary complex numbers. Let $Y_1, \cdots, Y_n$ be n elements of $T_\sigma C_n$ then by formula (2) we have

$$d\rho_{|(\sigma,\cdots,\sigma)}(Y_1, \cdots, Y_n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sigma^{i-1} Y_i \sigma^{n-i}.$$

Since σ corresponds to $(12\cdots n)$, it is easy to see that $\sigma^{i-1}Y_i\sigma^{n-i}$ is a matrix with zero entries everywhere except the i-th column. On the other hand, Y_i's are independent from each other, this suffices to show that the rank of $d\rho_{|(\sigma,\cdots,\sigma)}$ is n^2. □

Proposition 3.10 together with Proposition 6.1 imply

Theorem 6.2. *Every $n\times n$ invertible matrix is a product of $2n$ companion matrices. Every $n\times n$ matrix is a prodcut of $4n$ companion matrices and a diagonal matrix.*

Since the map

$$\rho_n : \underbrace{C_n\times\cdots\times C_n}_{n \text{ copies}} \to \mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$$

is dominant, by Proposition 3.2 we see that for a generic matrix $A\in\mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$, the fiber $\rho_n^{-1}(A)$ is of dimension zero and hence $\rho_n^{-1}(A)$ is a finite set. In fact, we can prove more.

Theorem 6.3. *The decomposition of a generic $n\times n$ matrix into the product of n companion matrices is unique, i.e., for a generic $n\times n$ matrix A, if*

$$A = C_1\cdots C_n = C_1'\cdots C_n',$$

where $C_i, C_i', i=1,2,\ldots,n$ are companion matrices then $C_i = C_i'$ for all $i=1,\ldots,n$.

Proof. We consider n companion matrices $C_1,\ldots,C_n$ and write

$$C_i \coloneqq \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & c_{i,1}\\ 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & c_{i,2}\\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots\\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & c_{i,n}\end{bmatrix}$$

and calculate the product

$$X^k = C_1\ldots C_k.$$

We claim that the (p,q)-th entry $X^k_{p,q}$ of X^k is a polynomial in c_{ij} where $1\le i\le n$ and $1\le j\le q-1$ and it is of the form

$$X^k_{p,q} = \begin{cases} \sum_{j=1}^{q+k-n-1} X^k_{p,q-j}c_{q+k-n,n-j+1} + c_{q+k-n,n+1+p-q-k}, & \text{if} q\ge n-k+1\\ 1, & \text{if } p-q=k \text{ and } q<n-k+1\\ 0, & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

If $k=n$ then

$$X^n_{p,q} = \sum_{j=1}^{q-1} X^n_{p,q-j}c_{q,n-j+1} + c_{q,p-q+1}.$$

Now given a generic $n\times n$ matrix $A=(a_{ij})$, we can find $c_{ij}, 1\le i,j\le n$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} a_{p,1} &= c_{1,p},\\ a_{p,2} &= a_{p,1}c_{2,n} + c_{2,p-1},\\ a_{p,3} &= a_{p,2}c_{3,n} + a_{p,1}c_{3,n-1} + c_{3,p-2},\\ &\vdots\\ a_{p,n} &= a_{p,n-1}c_{n,n} + a_{p,n-2}c_{n,n-1} + \cdots + a_{p,1}c_{n,2} + c_{n,p-n+1},\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

and those c_{ij}'s are uniquely determined by (3). Those C_i where

$$C_i \coloneqq \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & c_{i,1}\\ 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & c_{i,2}\\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots\\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & c_{i,n}\end{bmatrix}$$

are the desired companion matrices such that

$$A = C_1 \cdots C_n.$$

□

The proof of Theorem 6.3 actually gives another way to show that a generic $n \times n$ matrix is a product of n companion matrices. Moreover, it also gives an algorithm to decompose a generic $n \times n$ matrix into the product of n companion matrices. In Algorithm 1, the input is an $n \times n$ matrix $A = (a_{ij})$ with entries $a_{ij}, 1 \leq i, j \leq n$ and the out put is a sequence of n companion matrices $C_1, \ldots, C_n$ such that $A = C_1 \cdots C_n$ if such a decomposition exists and is unique.

Algorithm 1 Companion matrix decomposition

1: **for** $p, q = 1, 2, \ldots, n$ **do**
2: Solve the linear system

$$a_{p,q} = \sum_{j=1}^{q-1} a_{p,q-j} c_{q,n-j+1} + c_{q,p-q+1}$$

for $c_{q,1}, \ldots, c_{q,n}$. Here we adopt the convention that $a_{i,j}, c_{i,j} = 0$ if either $i \leq 0$ or $j \leq 0$.
3: If the solution does not exist or is not unique, the decomposition of A does not exist or is not unique. Stop the algorithm. Otherwise, define a matrix

$$C_q \coloneqq \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & c_{q,1} \\ 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & c_{q,2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 & c_{q,n} \end{bmatrix},$$

and continue the algorithm.
4: **end for**

Lastly, we remark that it is not true that every $n \times n$ matrix is a product of n companion matrices. Indeed, if we consider a matrix $A = (a_{ij})$ where

$$a_{11} = 0, a_{12} = 1,$$

then from (3) that we must have

$$c_{11} = a_{11} = 0, a_{11} c_{2n} = a_{12} = 1,$$

which is impossible. Hence the companion matrix decomposition is an example where the map ρ_r is dominant but not surjective, as we have remarked in Section 4.

6.2. **Generalized Vandermond decomposition.** Now we consider generalized Vandermonde matrices. First we need to define generalized Vandermonde matrices.

Definition 6.4. Let s be an integer we call a matrix of the form

$$\left((x_q)^{s+p-1}\right) = \begin{bmatrix} x_1^s & x_2^s & \cdots & x_{n-1}^s & x_n^s \\ x_1^{s+1} & x_2^{s+1} & \cdots & x_{n-1}^{s+1} & x_n^{s+1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ x_1^{s+n-1} & x_2^{s+n-1} & \cdots & x_{s+n-1}^{n-1} & x_n^{s+n-1} \end{bmatrix}$$

a generalized Vandermonde matrix of type s. We denote the set of all generalized Vandermonde matrix of type s by Vand_s and the set of transpose of generalized Vandermonde matrices of type s by $\mathrm{Vand}_s^{\mathsf{T}}$.

By the definition, a Vandermonde matrix is a generalized Vandermonde matrix of type 0. We consider the matrix decomposition for generalized Vandermonde matrices and their transpose.

Proposition 6.5. *Let $s_1, s_2, \ldots, s_n$ be n integers such that $s_i \not\equiv s_j (\mod n)$ if $i \neq j$ and $\sum_{j=1}^{n} s_j \neq 0$. A generic $n \times n$ matrix is a product of elements in Vand_{s_i} and $\mathrm{Vand}_{s_i}^{\mathsf{T}}, i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$.*

Proof. Again, we need to prove that the map

$$\rho_{2n} : \mathrm{Vand}_{s_1}^{T} \times \mathrm{Vand}_{s_1} \times \cdots \times \mathrm{Vand}_{s_n}^{T} \times \mathrm{Vand}_{s_n} \to \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$$

is dominant. Let w be a primitive n-th root of unity. Let

$$W_i = \{B_i \cdot A_i | B_i \in \mathrm{Vand}_{s_i}^{T}, A_i = (w^{-q(p-1+s_i)}) \in \mathrm{Vand}_{s_i}\}.$$

It is clear that $W_i \subset \mathrm{Vand}_{s_i}^{T} \cdot \mathrm{Vand}_{s_i}$ and that $\mathrm{Id} \in W_i$. Then it suffices to show that

$$\rho_n : W_1 \times \cdots \times W_n \to \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$$

is dominant. For this, we will show that the differential $d\rho_n$ at $(\mathrm{Id}, \mathrm{Id}, \ldots, \mathrm{Id})$ is surjective. Consider the differential

$$d\rho_n|_{(\mathrm{Id},\mathrm{Id},\ldots,\mathrm{Id})}(X_1, \ldots, X_n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i,$$

where $X_i = ((q + s_i - 1)w^{p(q+s_i-2)}x_{p,i}) \cdot (w^{-q(p+s_i-1)}) \in T_{\mathrm{Id}}W_i$ and $x_{p,i}$'s are variables. Then a simple calculation shows that

$$X_i = (\sum_{k=1}^{n}(k + s_i - 1)w^{(p-q)k})w^{p(s_i-2)-q(s_i-1)}x_{p,s_i}.$$

Let $\xi_{p,q,i} = (\sum_{k=1}^{n}(k + s_i - 1)w^{(p-q)k})w^{p(s_i-2)-q(s_i-1)}$. We regard $\mathbb{C}^{n\times n}$ as $\mathbb{C}^{n^2}$ by the linear isomorphism

$$h : \mathbb{C}^{n \times n} \to \mathbb{C}^{n^2}$$

defined by

$$h((x_{i,j})) = (x_{1,1}, x_{1,2}, \cdots, x_{1,n}, x_{2,1}, x_{2,2}, \cdots, x_{2,n}, \cdots, x_{n,1}, x_{n,2}, \cdots, x_{n,n}).$$

Let M be the coefficient matrix of $d\rho_{2n}|_{(\mathrm{Id},\mathrm{Id},\ldots,\mathrm{Id})}$ then M is an $n^2 \times n^2$ matrix and

$$M = \begin{bmatrix}
\xi_{1,1,1} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \xi_{1,1,2} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & \xi_{1,1,n} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
\xi_{1,2,1} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \xi_{1,2,2} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & \xi_{1,2,n} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
\xi_{1,n,1} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \xi_{1,n,2} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & \xi_{1,n,n} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\
0 & \xi_{2,1,1} & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \xi_{2,1,2} & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \xi_{2,1,n} & \cdots & 0 \\
0 & \xi_{2,2,1} & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \xi_{2,2,2} & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \xi_{2,2,n} & \cdots & 0 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
0 & \xi_{2,n,1} & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \xi_{2,n,2} & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \xi_{2,n,n} & \cdots & 0 \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
0 & 0 & \cdots & \xi_{n,1,1} & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \xi_{n,1,2} & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \xi_{n,1,n} \\
0 & 0 & \cdots & \xi_{n,2,1} & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \xi_{n,2,2} & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \xi_{n,2,n} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
0 & 0 & \cdots & \xi_{n,n,1} & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \xi_{n,n,2} & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \xi_{n,n,n}
\end{bmatrix}.$$

Where $d\rho_{2n}|_{(\mathrm{Id},\mathrm{Id},\ldots,\mathrm{Id})}(X_1,\ldots,X_n)=\sum_{i=1}^{n}X_i$ can be expressed as

$$\begin{bmatrix}
\xi_{1,1,1} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \xi_{1,1,2} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & \xi_{1,1,n} & 0 & \cdots & 0\\
\xi_{1,2,1} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \xi_{1,2,2} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & \xi_{1,2,n} & 0 & \cdots & 0\\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots\\
\xi_{1,n,1} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \xi_{1,n,2} & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & \xi_{1,n,n} & 0 & \cdots & 0\\
0 & \xi_{2,1,1} & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \xi_{2,1,2} & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \xi_{2,1,n} & \cdots & 0\\
0 & \xi_{2,2,1} & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \xi_{2,2,2} & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \xi_{2,2,n} & \cdots & 0\\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots\\
0 & \xi_{2,n,1} & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \xi_{2,n,2} & \cdots & 0 & \cdots & 0 & \xi_{2,n,n} & \cdots & 0\\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots\\
0 & 0 & \cdots & \xi_{n,1,1} & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \xi_{n,1,2} & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \xi_{n,1,n}\\
0 & 0 & \cdots & \xi_{n,2,1} & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \xi_{n,2,2} & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \xi_{n,2,n}\\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots\\
0 & 0 & \cdots & \xi_{n,n,1} & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \xi_{n,n,2} & \cdots & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \xi_{n,n,n}
\end{bmatrix}\cdot\begin{bmatrix}
x_{1,s_1}\\ x_{2,s_1}\\ \vdots\\ x_{n,s_1}\\ x_{1,s_2}\\ x_{2,s_2}\\ \cdots\\ x_{n,s_2}\\ \vdots\\ x_{1,s_n}\\ x_{2,s_n}\\ \vdots\\ x_{n,s_n}
\end{bmatrix}.$$

Now we will prove that M is of the full rank n^2. Since by permutation of columns, M becomes a block diagonal matrix where blocks M_p on the diagonal are

$$M_p=\begin{bmatrix}
\xi_{p,1,1} & \xi_{p,1,2} & \cdots & \xi_{p,1,n}\\
\xi_{p,2,1} & \xi_{p,2,2} & \cdots & \xi_{p,2,n}\\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots\\
\xi_{p,n,1} & \xi_{p,n,2} & \cdots & \xi_{p,n,n}
\end{bmatrix}.$$

Therefore, it suffices to prove that M_p is of rank n for each $p=1,2,\ldots,n$. Note that we have a formulas

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n}kw^k=\frac{-nw}{1-w},$$
$$\sum_{k=1}^{n}w^k=0.$$

for any n-th root of unity $w\neq 1$. Hence

$$\xi_{p,i,j}=\begin{cases}
-\frac{nw^{p-i}}{1-w^{p-i}}w^{(p-i)s_j-2p+i}, & \text{if } p\neq i\\
\frac{(2s_j+n-1)nw^{-p}}{2}, & \text{if } p=i.
\end{cases}$$

Then it is easy to see that the rank of M_p is the same as the matrix $\tilde{M}_p=(\tilde{\xi_{p,i,j}})$, where

$$\tilde{\xi}_{p,i,j}=\begin{cases}
w^{-is_j}, & \text{if } i\neq p\\
s_jw^{-ps_j}, & \text{if } i=p.
\end{cases}$$

Up to a permutation of rows, $\tilde{M}_p$ is of the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ w^{-s_1} & w^{-s_2} & \cdots & w^{-s_n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ w^{-(p-1)s_1} & w^{-(p-1)s_2} & \cdots & w^{-(p-1)s_n} \\ \alpha_1 w^{-ps_1} & \alpha_2 w^{-ps_2} & \cdots & \alpha_n w^{-ps_n} \\ w^{-(p+1)s_1} & w^{-(p+1)s_2} & \cdots & w^{-(p+1)s_n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ w^{-(n-1)s_1} & w^{-(n-1)s_2} & \cdots & w^{-(n-1)s_n} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $\alpha_1, \cdots, \alpha_n$ are fixed integers. We still denote this matrix by $\tilde{M}_p$ where $p = 0, 1, \cdots, n-1$. We will compute the determinant of $\tilde{M}_p$. We have

$$\mathrm{Det}(\tilde{M}_p) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} (-1)^{p+j-1} \alpha_j w^{-ps_j} V(w^{-s_j}) S_{j,n-1-p}.$$

Where $V(w^{-s_j})$ is the determinant of the Vandermonde matrix determined by w^{-s_1}, $\cdots$, $w^{-s_{j-1}}$, $w^{-s_{j+1}}$, $\cdots, w^{-s_n}$ and $S_{j,n-1-p}$ is the $(n-1-p)$-th symmetric function on w^{-s_1}, $\cdots$, $w^{-s_{j-1}}$, $w^{-s_{j+1}}$, $\cdots$, w^{-s_n}.

Note that

$$(t - w^{-s_1}) \cdots (t - w^{-s_n}) = t^n - 1,$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} (t - w^{-s_1}) \cdots (t - w^{-s_{j-1}})(t - w^{-s_{j+1}}) \cdots (t - w^{-s_n}) &= \frac{t^n - 1}{t - w^{-s_j}} \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} (w^{-s_j})^k t^{n-1-k}, \end{aligned}$$

hence $S_{j,n-1-p} = (-1)^p (w^{-s_j})^{n-1-p} = (w^{-s_j})^{-1-p}$.

On the other hand, we know that

$$V(w^{-s_j}) = \prod_{a>b, a, b\neq j} (w^{-s_a} - w^{-s_b}) = (-1)^{j-1} \frac{\prod_{a>b} (w^{-s_a} - w^{s_b})}{\prod_{c\neq j} (w^{-s_c} - w^{-s_j})}.$$

Let V be the determinant of the Vandermonde matrix determined by $w^{-s_1}, \cdots, w^{-s_n}$. It is obvious that $V \neq 0$. Also from

$$\frac{t^n - 1}{t - w^{-s_j}} = \prod_{c\neq j} (t - w^{-s_c}),$$

we have

$$\prod_{c\neq j} (w^{-s_c} - w^{-s_j}) = \lim_{t \to w^{-s_j}} \frac{t^n - 1}{t - w^{-s_j}} = n w^{s_j}.$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Det}(\tilde{M}_p) &= \sum_{j=1}^{n}(-1)^{p+j-1}\alpha_j w^{-ps_j}(-1)^p(w^{-s_j})^{-1-p}(-1)^{j-1}\frac{\prod_{a>b}(w^{-s_a}-w^{s_b})}{\prod_{c\neq j}(w^{-s_c}-w^{-s_j})}\\ &= V\sum_{j=1}^{n}\frac{\alpha_j w^{s_j}}{\prod_{c\neq j}(w^{-s_c}-w^{-s_j})}\\ &= V\sum_{j=1}^{n}\frac{\alpha_j w^{s_j}}{nw^{s_j}}\\ &= \frac{V}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\alpha_j.\end{aligned}$$

In particular, we set $\alpha_j = s_j$ then we see that $\mathrm{Det}(\tilde{M}_p) \neq 0$ if and only if $\sum_{j=1} s_j \neq 0$. This implies that the map ρ_n is dominant for all $s_1, \ldots, s_n$ such that $s_i \not\equiv s_j(\ mod\ n)$ and $\sum_{j=1}^{n} s_j \neq 0$. □

From the proof of Proposition 6.5 we have

Corollary 6.6. *Let $s_1, \ldots, s_n$ be as in Proposition 6.5 and let*

$$W_i = \{B_i \cdot A_i | B_i \in \mathrm{Vand}_{s_i}^T, A_i = (w^{-q(p-1+s_i)})\}.$$

A generic $n \times n$ matrix is a product of elements in $W_i, i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$.

Combining Proposition 3.10 and Proposition 6.5 we obtain

Theorem 6.7. *Let $s_1, \ldots, s_n$ be as in Proposition 6.5. For every $n \times n$ invertible matrix M there are $A_i, A_i' \in \mathrm{Vand}_{s_i}$ and $B_i, B_i' \in \mathrm{Vand}_{s_i}^{\mathsf{T}}, i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$ such that*

$$M = B_1 A_1 \cdots B_n A_n B_1' A_1' \cdots B_n' A_n'.$$

For every $n \times n$ matrix M, there are $A_i, A_i', C_i, C_i' \in \mathrm{Vand}_{s_i}$, $B_i, B_i', D_i, D_i' \in \mathrm{Vand}_{s_i}^{\mathsf{T}}, i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$ and a diagonal matrix E such that

$$M = B_1 A_1 \cdots B_n A_n B_1' A_1' \cdots B_n' A_n' E D_1 C_1 \cdots D_n C_n D_1' C_1' \cdots D_n' C_n'.$$

Theorem 6.8. *Let $W_i, i = 1, 2 \ldots, n$ be as in Corollary 6.6. For every $n \times n$ invertible matrix M there is an element A_i in W_i for each $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$ such that*

$$M = A_1 \cdots A_n.$$

For every $n \times n$ matrix M there are $A_i, B_i \in W_i$ for each $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$ and a diagonal matrix C such that

$$M = A_1 \cdots A_n C B_1 \cdots B_n.$$

7. Conclusion

We discuss the existence of matrix decompositions for bidiagonal, skew symmetric, symmetric Toeplitz, persymmetric Hankel, generic, companion, generalized Vandermonde matrix decompositions, for both generic and arbitrary matrices.

It is natural to ask, for example, if the number of bidiagonal matrices needed to decompose a generic (resp. arbitrary) matrix is the smallest. For most types of matrix decompositions we discussed in this paper, the number we obtain is already the smallest for a generic matrix. It is

still open if the number we obtain is the smallest for an arbitrary matrix. We summarize our main results in the following table.

	r (generic)	sharpness	r (arbitrary)	algorithm
bidiagonal	$2n$	unknown	$8n$	unknown
skew symmetric ($n \geq 8$ even)	3	yes	13	unknown
symmetric Toeplitz	$\lfloor \frac{n+1}{2} \rfloor$	yes	unknown	unknown
companion	n	yes	$4n+1$	yes
generalized Vandermonde	$2n$	unknown	$8n+1$	unknown

References

[1] "Algorithms for the ages," *Science*, **287** (2000), no. 5454, pp. 799.

[2] A. Borel, *Linear Algebraic Groups*, 2nd Ed., Graduate Texts in Mathematics, **126**, Springer-Verlag, New York, NY, 1991.

[3] A. J. Bosch, "The factorization of a square matrix into two symmetric matrices," *Amer. Math. Monthly*, **93** (1986), no. 6, pp. 462–464.

[4] R. Howe, "Very basic Lie theory," *Amer. Math. Monthly*, **90** (1983), no. 9, pp. 600–623.

[5] A. W. Knapp, *Lie Groups Beyond an Introduction*, 2nd Ed., Progress in Mathematics, **140**, Birkhäuser, Boston, MA, 2002.

[6] G. W. Stewart, "The decompositional approach to matrix computation," *Comput. Sci. Eng.*, **2** (2000), no. 1, pp. 50–59.

[7] J. L. Taylor, *Several Complex Variables with Connections to Algebraic Geometry and Lie groups*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, **46**, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2002.

[8] K. Ye and L.-H. Lim, "Every matrix is a product of Toeplitz matrices," *Found. Comput. Math.*, **15** (2015), no. 6, pp. 1-22.

[9] I. R. Shafarevich, "Basic algebraic geometry. 1", Springer, Heidelberg, 2013.

[10] R. B. Bitmead and B. D. O. Anderson, "Asymptotically fast solution of Toeplitz and related systems of linear equations", *Linear Algebra Appl.*, **34** (1980), pp. 103-116.

[11] J. Weyman, *Cohomology of vector bundles and syzygies*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, **149**, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003.

[12] J. Harris, *Algebraic geometry*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, **133**, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.

[13] P. Griffiths and J. Harris, *Principles of algebraic geometry*, Wiley Classics Library, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1994.

[14] W. Fulton and J. Harris, *Representation theory*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, **129**, A first course, Readings in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1991.

[15] G. S. Ammar and W. B. Gragg, "Superfast solution of real positive definite Toeplitz systems," *SIAM J. Matrix Anal. Appl.*, **9** (1988), no. 1, pp. 61–76.

[16] Chandrasekaran, Venkat and Sanghavi, Sujay and Parrilo, A. Pablo and Willsky, S. Alan, "Rank-sparsity incoherence for matrix decomposition", *SIAM J. Optim.*, **21** (2011), no. 2, pp. 572-596.

[17] D. L. Donoho, and X. M. Huo, "Uncertainty principles and ideal atomic decomposition", *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, **47** (2001), no. 7, pp. 2845-2862.

[18] J. B. Victor, Z. Douglas and C. David, "Low-rank network decomposition reveals structural characteristics of small-world networks", *Phys. Rev. E*, vol. 92 (2015), iss. 6, 062822.

[19] H. Robin, *Algebraic Geometry*, **52**, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1977.

[20] H. Roger, C. R. Johnson, *Matrix Analysis*, Cambridge University Press, 1985.

[21] P. Okunev, "Necessary and sufficient conditions for existence of the LU factorization of an arbitrary matrix", *arXiv: 0506382*, (1997).

[22] Grayson, R. Daniel and M. E. Stillman, *Macaulay2, a software system for research in algebraic geometry*, Available at `http://www.math.uiuc.edu/Macaulay2/`.

Department of Statistics, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL 60637-1514.
E-mail address: `kye@galton.uchicago.edu`